

REMARKS

Claims 1, and 3 to 88 are pending in the present application. Applicants note with appreciation the Action's Allowance of claims 16 to 37. Claims 38 to 88 were previously withdrawn from consideration, and by this Amendment, Applicants hereby cancel the remaining claims; 1, 3 -15, and previously withdrawn claims 38 to 88.

In the above-noted Action, claims 1, 3-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a), as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,858,697 to Mayorga et al. ("Mayorga"). Specifically, the Action asserts that Mayorga teaches stabilizing cyclic siloxanes by the addition of specific compounds. (Col. 4, line 28). Such compounds, the Action asserts, inter alia, embrace both cyclic and linear siloxanes as evidenced by Examples 7 and 8 that teach component (a) of the pending claims. In addition, the Action further asserts that Column 4, lines 51 et seq., teach the addition of a free radical scavenger within the formula of component (b) of the pending Application. Therefore, the teachings of Mayorga render the pending Application obvious.

In response, without acquiescing to the legal basis of the above rejection, but to expedite prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claims 1, 3 -15, and submit that that the above rejection over Mayorga, cannot be maintained in the absence of the cancelled claims. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Action's rejection of claims 1, 3-15, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Action further rejected Claims 1,3 -15 as being unpatentable over, Mayorga above, in view of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to Lagendijk. Specifically, the Action asserts that Lagendijk teaches that both cyclic and linear hydrosiloxanes can be used to form silicon dioxide films for use in chemical vapor deposition. This disclosure, along with the above teaching of free radical scavengers by Mayorga, would motivate a skilled artisan to add, for example, BHT to the

composition of Lagendijk to obtain the benefits thereof. (See, page 3 of the Action).

In response, without acquiescing to the legal basis of the above rejection, but to expedite prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claims 1, 3 - 15, and submit that that the above rejection under Mayorga, in view of Lajendijk, cannot be maintained in the absence of the cancelled claims. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Action's rejection of claims 1, 3-15, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that since the remaining claims 16 to 37 have already been Allowed, the final rejection of the pending application should be withdrawn, and respectfully request Allowance of the pending Application, in its entirety.

July 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Paul D. Greeley
Reg. No. 31,019
Attorney for Applicant
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: (203) 327-4500
Fax: (203) 327-6401